

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 111 N. York St., New York. Entered as second-class matter, July 16, 1879, under Post Office No. 154, New York, New York. Postmaster: J. J. McLaughlin.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid outside New York.**  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.

**FOREIGN RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid outside New York.**  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.00; 1 year \$10.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.00; 1 year \$10.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.00; 1 year \$10.00.

**ADVERTISING RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid outside New York.**  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
 Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.

## Has Germany "Shot Her Bolt"?

A good deal of comment has been excited by Lord Kitchener's assertion last week that the Germans had "about shot their bolt." Various constructions have been placed upon the statement, but there is only one that seems in any sense reasonable. Beyond all question the Austro-German armies are as large to-day as they were in the opening months of the war, when their field forces were completely organized. But it is only by examining the figures for reserves that the actual situation is disclosed.

We do not know all the official figures for the losses of the combatants; we do have the estimates made by the Germans of the French losses, of the French of the German losses, and of the Germans of the Russian prisoners and casualties. On all sides the figures are plainly too large, but they serve as a basis for calculations.

German authorities fix the French losses for the first year at around 2,000,000. The French estimate for the Germans is 4,000,000. The French loss as estimated by the Germans represents half the men actually mobilized, numbering 4,000,000. On the same basis the German losses would be around 3,500,000, in both cases counting the men fit for service at one-tenth of the population. Let us accept the higher figure for the French and the lower for the German.

As to the Russians: The Duma was told that 5,000,000 Russians had been put in the field. The Germans claim that they and their ally have taken 2,500,000 prisoners. This is too high, but let us accept it. Now, the casualties in addition must be not less than 1,500,000; many of the prisoners were doubtless wounded. This means a total loss of 4,000,000. Allowing in the case of the French, Russians and Germans that a quarter of the casualties have been returned, the net loss for these nations would be French 1,500,000, Germans 2,000,000, Russians 3,500,000. The Austrian net loss approximates 2,400,000; the gross exceeds 3,000,000 and includes almost 1,000,000 prisoners.

We know the British loss fell but a little short of 400,000 for the first year, and the Belgian and Serbian may be reckoned at 250,000. Italy in her first months up to August 1 lost perhaps 100,000.

The aggregate permanent loss for the Allies is thus 5,600,000, and for the Teutonic powers 5,000,000. In the first year of the war the French and Russians, to make good their losses, put in the field together 4,500,000. The British put in 1,000,000 new troops, and the Italians 850,000. The Allies had in the field 4,500,000, their permanent casualties were 5,600,000, the fresh troops number 6,350,000. The net increase was thus 750,000, and they have now in the field about 5,250,000. In the same time the Teutonic allies merely made good their losses of 5,000,000 and still have 4,500,000 in the field.

Allowing one-tenth for the fraction of a national population available for war, the French have now a reserve of 500,000 plus the conscripts of 1917, that have just been called, or 900,000. But the British have raised 3,000,000 troops by volunteering and have only put 1,000,000 in, so they have available a reserve of 2,000,000, which may be measurably increased by further enlistments, say 500,000. The Italians have only put 850,000 in, and under the law of one-tenth they have left the difference between 850,000 and the 3,500,000 provided by a tenth of their population. But no one supposes they can equip such a number, and 500,000 is perhaps the largest number they may be expected to furnish this year.

As to Russia, a tenth of her population would give 17,000,000 available recruits. But this is a preposterous number to equip. At the outside she cannot hope to supply more than the 3,000,000 which was her quota last year. All told then, the Allies will have behind a field force of 5,250,000 reserves amounting to about 7,000,000. If their permanent casualties amount to the same figure as last year, that is, 5,600,000, they will still have 1,400,000 in reserve after keeping their field armies at their present figure of 5,250,000.

The case of the Teutonic allies is quite different. At the outset of the war they had 4,500,000 men in the field; they have lost 5,000,000 and have made them good, keeping their field armies at 4,500,000. But their total resources, applying the law of one-tenth, were materially less than 12,000,000. Back of their field armies they have now, therefore, a reserve of something less than 2,500,000, which will be increased by about 1,200,000 during the year when this year's classes in Germany and Austria are put in the field.

Field armies and reserve combined, the Austro-Germans have now 8,200,000. If their loss this year equals that of last, which was about 5,000,000, they will end the year with 3,200,000 and no reserves, as compared with the Allies, who will have 5,250,000 in the field and a reserve of 1,400,000. As 1,500,000 men in the west and 600,000 in the south facing Italy and

Serbia are the minimum for safety, this will leave but 1,200,000 to face 3,000,000 Russians. The 1,500,000 in the west will face not less than 2,000,000 French and Belgians plus another 1,000,000 of British. Now at the opening of the year of 1917, that is on August 1, 1916, Russia will still have 3,000,000 men available to reinforce her field armies; more if she can equip them. Italy will have more than a million, if she or her allies can equip them. Great Britain will have no new masses, but like the contestants she can doubtless supply a number equal to the annual class; for her it would be 450,000, for France 400,000. The Allies will thus have between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 to meet new losses.

But the Austro-Germans will have only the class of 1917 or of 1918 if, as is probable, they have anticipated, as the French have. All told they will then have only 1,200,000 in reserve and 3,200,000 in the field to face 5,000,000 in the field and 5,000,000 in reserve. Making all allowances it is plain that in the winter or spring of 1917 the Germans will be unable to hold their present lines and have to narrow their fronts east and west. They may have to do it a year from now, but before the second year is ended there is no reason why they should be actually in distress, although all chance of successful offensive operations would pass by next spring.

It is possible to eliminate the Turkish campaign from these calculations, because no attention is paid to the colonial and native troops employed by Great Britain and France, which are equal in numbers to the force used at the Dardanelles, although some of the colonial troops are in France and some of the home contingent at the Straits.

In sum, then, at the rate the casualty lists progressed during the past year, Germany will end the second year of the war with but 3,200,000 troops in the field and no immediate reserve, whereas the Allies will have 5,250,000 in the field and 1,400,000 in reserve or in the field, as they choose; that is, 6,650,000 against 3,200,000, or more than 2 to 1.

If we accept French estimates of German losses, as we have taken German estimates of French and Russian losses, it is clear that the German disadvantage will be greater and the danger point arrive sooner. Conceivably all the estimates are too high and then the German disadvantage will be felt a little later. But sooner or later it must be felt and the thing can hardly be postponed much longer than the end of the second year of the war. If Germany should get a decision and eliminate Russia this winter, then she would be able to meet her other foes about on an equality, certainly at no better ratio. Success in enlisting Balkan allies might increase her numbers a little, but not greatly, for their numbers are comparatively small.

Taking things as they are, it seems that Lord Kitchener has a little anticipated German distress, but not much. In France to-day the Anglo-French-Belgian forces amount to about 3,000,000. They have before them 1,500,000 Germans. At the outside Germany could not bring more than 750,000 troops from the Russian front without too great risks, and this would leave her still 750,000 inferior to the Allied forces in front of her, while the superiority of Allied reserves is tremendous. This is why a new German drive seems unlikely. A similar drive through Serbia would doubtless open a way to Constantinople, if it still held out, but would remove troops that will be needed when Russia equips her new levies. A drive against Italy might succeed, but by this time Italy should be able to put almost as many men in the field as the Germans plus the Austrians now facing them would amount to. She has also the advantage of strong defensive positions, and could be aided by the French or British in case of danger.

Germany may still win the war by getting a decision over some foe. But she has so far failed and the weight of numbers has already turned against her. Unless she gets her decision in the next ten months her position would seem utterly hopeless. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from the arithmetic of the situation, taking the view most favorable to Germany.

**Taxes and the New Constitution.**  
 How much the adoption of the new constitution means to New York City in the present financial crisis is indicated from two sources. The Advisory Council of Real Estate Interests estimates that with the proposed home rule provision of the new document in effect municipal bureaus and departments could be consolidated and reorganized to the tune of a \$13,000,000 annual saving. Mr. Tilden, Adamson, director of the Board of Estimate's Bureau of Standards, goes even further. He urges the budget-makers, now at work preparing the budget for 1916, to anticipate the adoption of the new constitution. Without calculating the possible saving in dollars and cents he argues that millions can be cut from the budget by putting the City Chamberlain into the Finance Department, consolidating the Bridge Department with the Department of Docks and Ferries, combining the Board of Water Supply and the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity, and making many kindred department changes. All these changes would be possible—and doubtless eminently desirable, as tending to efficiency and vastly less expense—if the home rule provision of the constitution should go into effect next year. If the constitution be not adopted this reorganization under Mr. Adamson's plan of course could not be put into effect, but in that case there could be issued special revenue bonds to carry along the present departments just as if their appropriations had been included in the budget.

New York City has not been treated fairly in the reapportionment controversy. Fortunately, that article is to be submitted for approval separately, so New Yorkers may express their resentment at this instance of shabby treatment of the metropolis by voting against it without endangering the main body of amendments to the constitution. The home rule provision, included in the main group, is one which every citizen of New York should vote for. It will make possible a sane, workable, cheap city government here such as only a city run by its elected officials, not by the Legislature, can expect to have.

**History Redrawn.**  
 This morning The Tribune prints the first in a series of cartoons portraying familiar historic scenes in a slightly modernized fashion.

Among the subjects of later cartoons are the following: Patrick Henry delivering his famous speech: "Give me liberty or give me 'strict accountability'"; Benjamin Franklin informing George III that the Declaration of Independence was for home consumption only; General Grant writing his memorable dispatch: "I intend to talk it out on this line if it takes all summer."

## Keep the City's Water Pure!

New York State is now bringing a suit in equity against the State of New Jersey to protect the residents of the upper West Side of this city from the stench of a chemical factory at Edgewater. This is a nuisance, but does not seriously endanger the health of New Yorkers. Yet New York State itself contemplates, in planning to discharge the sewage from Mohansic State Hospital into the Croton water supply, action which seriously menaces the purity of this city's drinking water, and therefore seriously menaces the health of the public of this city. This state, consequently, stands in the position of being willing to protect the city against a sister state, but of being unwilling to spend a comparatively small sum which would render the city safe against the proposed menace of its own state government.

Mayor Mitchell's protest to Governor Whitman is none too sharp. The importance of this menace to the health and comfort of the city cannot be overestimated. No treatment of the sewage of this state institution can assure New Yorkers complete protection against disease if the Croton water supply be polluted. And even if there should be no outbreak of disease, the fact would be ever present that the city's drinking water had been defiled by the sewage of some 6,000 persons.

This city cannot afford, obviously, to give up the Croton water supply. Under no consideration of fairness and decency should the state vitiate that supply. Governor Whitman should kill this vicious proposal.

Following German-American precedent, all the British, French, Russian and Belgian residents of Sweden should protest that if any Swedish banks dare to consider loaning money to Germany they will withdraw their deposits at once.

Dr. Dumba manifestly believes in pitiless publicity.

## Joffre and Napoleon.

(From The Manchester Guardian.)  
 A saying of General Joffre which has never been given the publicity it deserves comes from a correspondent who vouches for its accuracy. It illustrates charmingly the modesty of the man who has saved France. The General was explaining to a favored American visitor the position of the French army entrenchments on the plain beneath the hill where they stood, and he traced the course of the German lines beyond.

"It is a big job," said Joffre, "but I guess even Napoleon, if he had had all your troops to fight with here, would have had to dig himself in just the same."

"Ah!" said Joffre, slowly, stroking his chin. "Napoleon! No, I think Napoleon would have thought of something!"

## Mr. Masfield at the Front.

(From The Westminster Gazette.)  
 Mr. John Masfield has gone to the Dardanelles to take charge of a picket-boat and barge, which he has provided for the conveyance of wounded. Before he achieved literary fame and won the Royal Society of Literature's prize for the best literary effort of 1912 he had sailed the seas in the mercantile marine. This did not together satisfy his adventurous spirit, so he spent a few years on an American farm, and then he took to the more prosaic labors of a City office. He was born at Ledbury, in the West of England, something over thirty years ago, but he shuns publicity, and if you desire to know much about him you will find it in the usual books of reference.

## Reciprocity.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 (Sir: It was stated last week that Germany was debating new treaties to take the place of those in her "scrap" basket. The "favored nation" idea is to be discarded and "reciprocity" to be the order of the day. With the help of our schoolroom atlas we drew up a scheme which should appeal to every lover of fair play, neutral or otherwise. Thus: For said treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Germany, let the city of Dresden pay, refunding, with interest, the illegal indemnities wrung from a starving people. Bremen reimburse Antwerp when the old freedom of the seas, enjoyed equally by both, has been once more restored; Ghent—Munich; Liège—Stuttgart; Leuven—Leipzig; Namur—Cologne; and so on through the little kingdom, bankrupt in everything but honor. Reciprocity on this basis would meet with world-wide approval. And, to go further, Cologne, with its own beautiful cathedral intact, though well within range of the Allies' aeroplanes, might save the hideous sore of its sister city, Rheims; Nuremberg, with its lovely halls, give succor to Ayr and Mecklenburg; rebuild the tower of Lille.

Russia, on the other hand, may have her own ideas of reciprocity when her millions come back on the returning wave and may safely be left to exact it from Berlin, while Poland will demand the restoration of the library of Warsaw, already looted and carried into Germany. Reciprocity is a good old Bible theory, an iron rule as well as a golden one, and neutral nations would do well to consider "which hand they will have," as the children say. The Allies will be making new treaties, also, and have a name for keeping them, even though it be to their own hurt.  
 G. E. CULVER.  
 Dark Harbor, Me., Sept. 11, 1915.

## ADAPT SCHOOLS TO LIFE

## Make Changes Which Expert Opinion Demands, However Radical.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: Mr. Howard W. Nudd's recent letter is a timely exposition of the advantages of the Gary system and a persuasive plea for its extension in the schools of this city.

The United Hebrew Charities, through its committee on vocational guidance, has recently been giving considerable thought to this subject, and I feel it opportune that we record at this time the results of our study of the vocational needs of the children of some of the families under our care.

We fully realize that it is not the function of this or any committee on vocational guidance to appear as advocates of any particular educational system; but, needless to say, the success or failure of work in vocational guidance is to a great extent determined by the educational preparation of the children applying for such assistance.

In order to ascertain the vocational aptitude of these children we made a thorough study of their capabilities, personalities and family circumstances, as well as school records and physical condition. The result of our investigation for the first thirty-eight children showed that twenty-four of these gave no marked evidence of an aptitude for any particular trade, and neither their vocational school history nor their personal preference would warrant any choice. We fully realize that the number of children mentioned is not sufficiently large to warrant any definite conclusions; still the inclinations of those interviewed were so uncertain and undetermined that we were naturally compelled to realize that these children required an opportunity to test their aptitudes in the elements of the various manual, commercial and academic callings.

Our present educational system, with the exception of a few vocational schools, which are limited in capacity and open only to the children of certain ages and school standing, affords no such opportunity, and this committee naturally concluded that what was required was a period during which children would have the preliminary experiences above described in their regular school curriculum. Consequently we determined that children of this type should be recommended to a Gary school, provided we could secure their admission to such.

It is this experience which leads us to endorse the plan which is being made for a greater adaptation of our school system to the changed conditions of industrial life. Whether the Wirt plan or the Ettinger plan should be adopted is a question with which our organization cannot be properly concerned until their respective merits are determined. But this organization is so deeply concerned in the task of helping that portion of the future generation to whom it ministers to become happy, useful and self-sustaining citizens as to impel us to hope for a courageous readiness to institute such changes as may commend themselves to the prevailing expert educational opinion, however radical they may be.

HENRY J. ECKSTEIN,  
 Chairman, Committee on Vocational Guidance.  
 New York, Sept. 17, 1915.

## "Direct Nominations."

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: During his brilliant, if largely frustrated, campaign for "direct nominations" Governor Hughes deplored the fact that the people "tolerate so much in the way of perversion of the forms of government and allow to little coteries a large control of their political destinies."

This deplorable "embezzlement of power" by the little coteries in question may be possible—nay, we actually promote—by leaving to their pseudo-"political" organizations the critical, all-determining part of the electoral process: the declaring, with official effect, what names shall appear on the ballot as those of the "candidates" of the great parties, for which the coteries "conventions," "committees" and "leaders" profess to speak. The nomination is the thing, and so long as we delegate the function of nominating to notoriously undemocratic oligarchies so long will the Hughes-like official be a *varn* *varn*, indeed, and the Senator or Mayor, or judge "of commerce" only the shameless dummy or rubber stamp of the coterie that made him. The irony of it is that this nominating by coteries is utterly unnecessary. We already have three official "polling" opportunities, so to speak. Registration day, primary day and Election Day. Let us have registration day early in September, primary day early in October. On registration day let each voter "enroll" as a party member, on which he enrolls his suggestion, if any, as to the person his party shall nominate for any office to be filled on Election Day. For use on primary day an official ballot would then be printed, on which, under the title of each office to be filled, there would appear, in alphabetical order, the names of the five persons most numerous "suggested" for nomination to such office on enrollment day. On primary day each enrolled party member could mark, on such primary ballot, the one of such five suggested nominees whom he preferred for candidate, and the one who in this way got the plurality or majority at the primary would be the party's candidate for the particular office in question and would appear as such on the official ballot used on Election Day.

This plan would give official effect only to the acts of enrolled members of the party, acting individually and party members on usually pure "spoils" machinery which bosses so inevitably control would be restricted to such influence as it might have to persuade individual voters individually to "suggest" on the enrollment blanks, and, later, to "mark" each acting separately and personally on the primary ballots the nominee would then be simply one of five proposed nominees, all alike presented, on precisely equal terms, on the primary ballot. Thus, if a voter wished to elect a certain party voter could mark his personal choice in the voting booth on primary day.

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS.  
 Brooklyn, Sept. 14, 1915.

## The British Danger.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: Never a critic seemed more illogical in your columns than Mr. A. P. Phillips, who tries to deny your deep and true editorial on "The Marine—After a Year." Napoleon did not have 42-centimeter cannon and submarines which would have kept the channel clear for miles of British boats, thus insuring the passage of his troops.

With the French armies out of their way the Germans would be in England in a few weeks. The British should realize that danger, stop their strikes and firmly help their country to win that war, which is theirs as well as any of their allies.  
 PROSPER GUERRY.  
 Elizabeth, N. J., Sept. 14, 1915.



George Washington refusing command of the Continental army because he is "too proud to fight."

## TIRED OF JELLYFISHING

## The United States Must Act or Lose Self-Respect.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: I find myself, for once, in agreement with Mr. Roosevelt, who, commenting upon the perfectly proper appeal that American citizens should stand by the President at a time of national crisis, dryly observed that we must stand by the President provided he is right. There are many of us who have a personal admiration and respect for Mr. Wilson, but that does not commit us to a support of the administration policy of "watchful waiting."

There are rights committed to the United States in addition to those involved in these questions arising out of submarine warfare and the rights of neutral ships and commerce. Some of these rights which the United States has voluntarily assumed arise from the trustee duty to protect the interest of non-combatant nationals of belligerent powers through the United States consulates in the countries which are engaged in war. One such case arose in the Turkish Empire, where the protection of rights of French and English residents of the particular province, the persons being French and English nationals, non-combatants, and belonging to the occupation of missionaries and teachers, was assumed by the United States. Some of these persons, whose lives have been given up to disinterested service to the people among whom they were laboring, were suddenly seized by the Turkish Governor of the province and imprisoned, which imprisonment was coupled with the threat that for any Turkish life lost in any operations on the coast he would execute three of these prisoners.

They promptly appealed to the American Consulate to demand their release on the ground that such proceedings were in violation of all international law and treaties. The American Consul stated that it regretted exceedingly its inability to act, that the consul's instructions were "not to embroil the United States." But, it was represented, "if the case were reversed and Americans had been imprisoned and they appealed to the English Consul he would send his kawas and secure their release in twenty-four hours." Nevertheless, the consul was unable, under his instructions, to act.

I was instrumental in communicating these facts to the then Secretary of State, and in reply to my communication, urging that prompt and peremptory instructions be issued to the consul to protect the rights of these persons thus intrusted to the United States flag, the extraordinary statement was made that the Department of State was not yet informed that any of these persons had been actually executed. No public announcement has yet been made from which we can gather whether or not the release of these persons has been actually demanded by the United States and its dignity and self-respect preserved and reparation demanded for this insult to our flag, far more direct and outrageous than that which took place in Mexico.

In the second place, and in view of the fact that the policy of the administration is already being used as an argument for the re-election of Mr. Wilson, it is perfectly proper to emphasize anew (and in this I again find myself in unexpected agreement with Mr. Roosevelt) the fact that the United States never protested against the violation of the neutrality of Belgium. But and if this be deemed a dead issue, and certainly it would be rather late now to enter a series of "final" notes in this respect, what is the United States going to do (if it be the guardian of humanity, of civilization, from an international standpoint) with regard to the wholesale massacre of Christians in Asia Minor and Persia? They exceed in atrocity and in thoroughness anything that took place when the whole civilized world was outraged by what are now known as the Armenian massacres.

Mr. Morgenthau, one of our most efficient, hardworking and kindhearted ambassadors, is reported in the papers, has protested to the Turkish government, and if the new accounts are true, the answer to his protest was the hanging of a number of Armenians in the streets of Constantinople! It may be that from the international law standpoint we would be going out of our way to in-

## THE HABIT OF SIDESTEPPING

## Wilson's Policies Are Destroying the Nation's Strength.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: If our country's welfare is to be wisely considered the iniquitous habit of sidestepping every responsibility must be abandoned. If we continue to follow a policy of overlooking every insult and submitting to every indignity it will act like chlorine on our strength as a nation and American influence in foreign affairs will fall to the level of China's.

When the United States saw the approach of the European war some of us looked to the White House to see if our minority Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, would measure up to the stature of Grover Cleveland. We knew we needed a big man at the helm, for in the difficult crisis then at hand it was apparent to all that the United States must play an important role, and it was fervently hoped that Mr. Wilson would be equal to the great occasion.

After thirteen months of trials and tribulation we are disappointed with Mr. Wilson's leadership. To start with, he tried to inaugurate a doctrine of neutrality for this country which was little less than a crime against nature. Although distinguished as a champion of humanity, the rape of Belgium passed over his head without any protest. From the very beginning such a policy of neutrality was offensive and repugnant to us all.

A few months more, and Germany begins to murder innocent Americans on the high seas. The sinking of the Lusitania, without warning, was so stupefying in its cowardice that the American people felt that the least that could happen would be that Mr. Wilson would, with firmness and courage, send Ambassador von Bernstorff home to his native land. To avoid being discredited in the eyes of the world, this was as little as he could do. He, however, took a compromising course and entered into a negotiation with the German government which has availed us nothing except the loss of our self-respect. He has used such strong words as "strict accountability," "will omit no word or act," "deliberately unfriendly," etc., and the net result is that we are in a weaker position than if these ultimatums had not been sent.

Germany feels that the American people are willing to follow the cowardly doctrine of peace at any price. The German government is of the opinion that at the cost of our national honor and self-respect we will not be forced into war. Our notes to Germany and Mexico alike are mere "scraps of paper," because they are not reinforced by a determined and drastic attitude on the part of our government. Germany, Austria and Mexico are using this country as a receptacle for their odium, and the American people are getting tired of it.

After thirty-seven ultimatums, more or less, to Mexico, we now find the people of Mexico trying to capture Texas. Ambassadors von Bernstorff and Dumba should be, as far as this government is concerned, persons non grata. Both are deceitful and shift in their methods, and, believing that we are living in darkness, they have continued to maneuver as they please, until one has finally been caught. Not only Dumba but von Bernstorff has been interfering in our domestic affairs, and if the American people were consulted both would have been home. The people of this country have no desire to be infected by the anemic condition of Bryan.

If it is the subtle purpose of our present Washington administration to avoid war at any cost by living in a state of optimism, the fallacy of it all will not destroy the vision of the American people. It is a pity, indeed, that Mr. Wilson is not possessed of greater capacity. His mind seems to be perverted by sophistries, but this is peculiar to his character, and unless his policies change his feeble and insidious methods will ruin the stamina of this government. His is the cast of mind which does not see, because it will not look forward.

RICHARD HENRY GATLING.  
 New York, Sept. 13, 1915.

## Hans Schmidt.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: Can The Tribune inform the public why Hans Schmidt, who was convicted of the murder of Anna Aumuller, has not been executed? I would be very thankful for any information on the subject.  
 SUBSCRIBER.  
 Crafts, N. Y., Sept. 9, 1915.  
 [The case has not yet been decided by the Court of Appeals—Ed.]